

Armenians who survived Turkish massacres or survivors of the Holocaust), how to choose subjects, what kinds of questions to ask, how to use teamwork, what background information is necessary to make interviews meaningful, how to store and index information, how to get permission to use data, the difficulties in transcribing recordings, and how best to use the results (A sound medium only, possibly using parts of recordings? Portions of videotapes or still photographs in a visual presentation? Printed publication?). Finally, he suggests ways of verifying the data, looking for internal consistency, cross checking with other sources, and seeing if the data fit a known context.

At every step along the way Thompson is explicit and clear, and he offers many examples. Even a novice could do a creditable job by using this book. But there is more, almost thirty pages of valuable notes and suggestions for further reading and ten pages of model questions for interviews, ranging from childhood activities to political views. *The Voice of the Past* belongs in every university, high school, and public library, as well as in departments of history. My only personal regret is that Thompson did not use the works of Harvard psychiatrist Robert Coles (*Children of Crisis* and the next half dozen volumes).

What is History Today? contains thirteen chapters, each dealing with a variety of academic history: military, political, economic, social, religious, scientific, women's, art, intellectual, popular culture, diplomatic, European (but not American), and "third world." In each, four to six historians working in the field furnish their views of their specialties. Since each historian has but a page or two, the discussions are largely superficial, probably best aimed at bright undergraduates who want to explore in advance what fields might be interesting for further study. Too, since the historians are overwhelmingly British, some of their essays will seem a bit strange to American students. One might want to keep a copy of this book in departments of history, but few historians will get much out of it.

Georgia State University

Robert W. Sellen

Zev Garber, ed. *Methodology in the Academic Teaching of the Holocaust*. Lanham MD & London: University Press of America, 1988. Pp. xxvii, 327. Cloth, \$36.75; paper, \$17.50.

Charles S. Maier. *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1988. Pp. xi, 227. Cloth, \$22.50.

Although the two books under review both deal with the subject of the Holocaust, they are of a very different order. *Methodology in Teaching the Holocaust* is a collection of essays purporting to offer practical advice on teaching various aspects of the Holocaust. *The Unmasterable Past* focuses on the current historical conflict (*Historikerstreit*) in Germany over the place and memory of the Third Reich and the Holocaust within German history. Since the books are so different in their goals, I will treat them separately.

Maier's book, if less directly concerned with teaching, is the more interesting and stimulating work. Maier offers a comprehensive analysis of the historical debate currently raging among historians in Germany over how to deal with the legacy of the Nazi Third Reich. On the one hand, according to Maier, are the "revisionists" who, while not denying the horrors of the Nazi regime, seek to "historicize" them by comparing them to other twentieth-century atrocities, thereby denying their special character. On the other hand, critics like Jurgen Habermas, one of the leading philosophers and social thinkers of contemporary Germany, have charged that conservative German historians were seeking to "relativize" the Final Solution to create a new nationalist and conservative usable past. Thus, according to Habermas, these historians are distorting and politicizing history.

Andreas Hillgruber, a noted scholar of diplomacy and World War II, is among the most respected of these "revisionists." In 1986 he published a work in which he discusses both the shattering of the Third Reich and the end of European Jewry. In it Hillgruber justifies the Wehrmacht's bitter resistance against the advancing Soviet forces in the winter of 1944-45. He not only asks us to "identify" sympathetically with the ordinary German soldier and with the danger to the German population that might follow a Russian victory (rape, pillage, mass murder), but he argues that the only right action for a good German was to support the Fatherland against the gathering hordes. This at a time when resistance to Hitler might have meant the ending of the extermination of the Jews.

Indeed, Hillgruber groups the demise of the Reich with that of European "Jewry" as equivalent phenomena: in the one case the end of a state and national community with deep roots in East Central Europe, and in the other, the end of the corporate existence of European Jewry. As Maier

so pointedly indicates, such use of comparison dangerously obfuscates rather than clarifies. It was the end of several million individual Jews at the hands of the Nazi regime and its military, not of the corporate existence of "Jewry," that is critical and that belies the comparability. And, of course, Germany brought on its own end by starting the war.

The most salient hallmark of revisionist historiography in Germany centers on the analogy and even interconnectedness between the Holocaust and the Soviet massacres of the Kulaks and old Bolsheviks of the 1930s. By denying the uniqueness, even the special character of the destruction of European Jewry, Ernst Nolte and Joachim Fest hope to cleanse the conscience of the German people and rebuild German national pride. They maintain not only that the Gulag served as a precedent and was even "more original" than Auschwitz but that "class murder on the part of the Bolsheviks [was] logically and actually prior to racial murder on the part of the Nazis." Thus Nolte suggests that killing the Jews was a defensive mechanism against the potential threat to Germany by the "Asian" menace.

Maier makes his own superb analysis of the comparability of the Holocaust with other atrocities of the twentieth century and comes down on the side of difference. What sets apart the National Socialist crime from that of the Soviet, he argues, is the murder of the Jews. Only in the case of the Jews was every individual targeted for extermination; only the Nazis established camps exclusively for extermination; and only the Nazis defined all the Jews of Europe as their enemy. Maier does not try to minimize the Stalinist slaughters nor to suggest that they were less bad but rather to argue for their differences. He also insists on separating the ideology of Bolshevism from that of National Socialism, arguing that there is a difference between a philosophy whose logic is monstrous and one that can be given a monstrous interpretation.

Maier draws heavily from Habermas's critique of the revisionists but maintains that he too has politicized history far too much and has dismissed too summarily the potential legitimacy of comparison and historicization of the Nazi regime. Comparing the Nazi regime in all its aspects to other regimes in Germany or outside is legitimate and can bring important insights, according to Maier. All too often, however, these comparisons have been misused to reshape historical memory in order to "normalize" Germany today. According to Maier, if Germany is to retake its place among the community of nations it must not forget but "overcome." The basis for achieving a new and proud national consensus is not by obscuring but repairing so far as possible.

Some of this book is heavy going and would be difficult for many undergraduates. Still, the chapter on the comparability of the Holocaust is among the best I have seen on the question of uniqueness and would be useful for a course dealing with genocide and other mass atrocities. The chapter on "Museums, Memory and Identity" is a superb case study, as is much of the book, on the interconnectedness between historical memory and contemporary politics, and would serve as a useful component of a course on historiography.

Edited by Zev Garber, the second book under review is a collection of articles that supposedly treat teaching methodology. In fact, only a few of the essays are directly devoted to teaching; most are on a hodgepodge of subjects. Grouped in four parts, "Theory and Methods," "Teaching Others," "Literature and the Arts," and "Surveys and Reports," the book pretends to more coherence than it actually has. Perhaps because of my expectations for some good ideas on how to approach teaching the Holocaust at the college level, I found this book disappointing. Some of the articles that do directly touch on teaching are little more than sketchy outlines, while others make only a forced bow at the end of the article to classroom teaching.

The book, however, has some interesting essays. Arye Carmon's piece on teaching the Holocaust in Israel reveals much about that country's changing political culture. Livia Bitton-Jackson usefully traces the "blood myth" to early Christian times, arguing that the Christian populations of Europe were desensitized to Nazi atrocities because of this long history. Ruth Zerner, "Resistance and Submission: Teaching About Responses to Oppression," has a suggestive if short piece on personalizing the Holocaust for her students through the reading of personal memoirs and the use of student journals. But even some of these essays are not as clearly focused on teaching or, for that matter, as clearly focused as I would have liked.

The most useful and well thought out essay was on "Teaching About the Rescuers of Jews" by Lawrence Baron. Baron is involved in an international project interviewing rescuers and analyzing

the variables that help explain their assistance to Jews. His article briefly describes the "altruism" project and its findings and then offers some specific recommendations on readings and how to teach this segment of the course. Unlike so many of the other articles, this was a model combination of important new research with effective ideas on how to teach the findings.

SUNY College at Cortland

Sanford Gutman

Daniel Brower. *The World in the Twentieth Century: The Age of Global War and Revolution.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1988. Pp. 363. Paper, \$27.80. (Second edition due September 1991—paper, \$26.67.)

For high school teachers, one of the difficulties in introducing new courses or new approaches to traditional courses is finding suitable textbooks. In the typical secondary school system, the Contemporary World History course has been traditionally a Modern European History course with periodic references to the rest of the world.

The World in the Twentieth Century: The Age of Global War and Revolution by David Brower is a fairly new textbook that can be used for world history courses either in college or upper-level high school classes. Though there is still greater emphasis on Europe, in general it is a worthy attempt at an encompassing twentieth-century world history text.

The overriding theme of the book is expressed in the subtitle—the Age of Global War and Revolution. The book is political rather than social history. Brower is also concerned with industrialization, imperialism, and nationalism, all of which are related to war (hot and cold) and revolution. Each area of the world is discussed as it pertains to the theme of a particular time period. The United States is not treated separately, but, refreshingly, as part of the world system, as part of a world theme.

At the beginning of the book there is a time chart showing, by rows, a date followed by key events in the area of the world designated by column headings. This chart provides good information for a teacher to use for background settings and comparisons.

Brower makes a good attempt to give relative importance to each world region connected with a chapter theme. For example, the discussion of post World War I includes European recovery, but also the Middle East and imperialism in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. On the other hand, if an area is not particularly related to a theme, he does not include it just to "cover the world." For example, the chapter "Depression and Dictators" mentions the global impact of the Depression but focuses on two fundamental results in terms of the world—Nazi and Stalin's Russia.

Brower also may pick a country or region that particularly emphasizes his point even though it may not be the usual example, such as the attention given Turkey after World War I or Cuba when discussing Latin America and the Superpowers.

One of the best features of the book is the writing style. Brower uses narration more typical of a general nonfiction work than a textbook. The facts and detail are there, but they are part of the "essay" rather than the bulk of the writing; the facts support his thesis. Brower makes his opinions clear which also makes this text different from the usual. Two excerpts illustrate this point:

After four years of bitter, bloody fighting, the postwar world depended only partly on the decisions of statesmen. Political events took a course of their own. . . .

Did Castro really intend at that point to collaborate with other liberal forces in a constitutional democracy after the revolution? Probably not, for he had fundamentally revised his political objectives since 1952. His definition of democracy stressed rule for the people, not by the people.

Because this book is more an interpretive history than a presentation of objective information, it is also more likely to generate discussion from students than is usually the case in a high school class.

At the end of each chapter is a suggested bibliography for each major topic covered. In addition, Brower has a welcome addition with suggested memoirs and novels. Though there are a few maps and photos, one of the weaknesses of the book is the lack of documents and excerpts from original writings. This is a greater problem for high schools because, in general, they have very